

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

Addison A. Edwards,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 25-cv-10417

v.

HON. MARK A. GOLDSMITH

Auto Zone, Inc.,

Defendant.

\_\_\_\_\_ /

**ORDER REGARDING JURISDICTION**

This matter is presently before the Court on Defendant Auto Zone, Inc.’s notice of removal (Dkt. 1). The notice of removal states that the Court has subject-matter jurisdiction based on diversity of citizenship. See Notice of Removal ¶ 3. Under the diversity jurisdiction statute, 28 U.S.C. § 1332, federal district courts have jurisdiction over matters in which there is “complete diversity such that no plaintiff is a citizen of the same state as any defendant.” V & M Star, LP v. Centimark Corp., 596 F.3d 354, 355 (6th Cir. 2010). In a diversity case, the party asserting jurisdiction—in this case, Defendant—bears the burden of establishing it. See Hertz Corp. v. Friend, 559 U.S. 77, 96 (2010).

To properly allege an individual’s citizenship, a party must make allegations regarding the state in which that individual is domiciled—i.e., where the individual both (i) resides and (ii) intends to remain. Farmer v. Fisher, 386 F. App’x 554, 557 (6th Cir. 2010). Defendant makes allegations regarding where Plaintiff resides, but not where Plaintiff intends to remain. Therefore, the Court cannot conclude that it has subject-matter jurisdiction over this action based on diversity of citizenship.

Defendant is ordered to file an amended notice of removal within 10 days of the date of entry of this order setting forth proper jurisdictional allegations. If Defendant believes that the current allegations are sufficient, it must file a memorandum explaining its position within the same 10-day period. Failure to comply with this order will result in the remand of this case to state court for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: March 13, 2025  
Detroit, Michigan

s/Mark A. Goldsmith  
MARK A. GOLDSMITH  
United States District Judge